



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/711,369	11/10/2000	Babak Rezvani	COR185-150117-4	6817
21831	7590	07/28/2006	EXAMINER	
WOLF BLOCK SCHORR AND SOLIS-COHEN LLP			KE, PENG	
250 PARK AVENUE			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10177			PAPER NUMBER	
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/711,369	Applicant(s) REZVANI ET AL.	
	Examiner Peng Ke	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-21, 23 and 25-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-21, 23, 25-38 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 5/9/06.

Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23, 25-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 38, 39, and 40 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 39, and 40^{are} rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman et al. (US 6,603,488) in view of Joerg (US 2001/0049671) further in view of Endsley US Patent 6,005,613

As per claim 39 Humpleman teaches a service broker system having a customizable presentation environment for interactive monitoring and control of data to and from computers and/or internet enabled devices of a client/server system for safety application over the Internet, the environment (fig. 5A, item 402) comprising:

An interactive presentation having a plurality of object placeholders, each for holding a presentable object or presentable reference to an object. (figure .6, items 506, 504; col. 14, lines 11-20)

Each placeholder having a resource for selecting the presentable object or reference held therein and a resource for selecting the placeholder; (col. 11, lines 1-21) and

A data store for storing the presentable objects; (col. 12, lines 50-56)

Wherein the arrangement of the presentable objects, reference, or both within the placeholders corresponds at least in part to the manner in which the presented objects and reference are linked. (fig. 7, item 606)

However, Humpleman fails to teach the presentable objects being linked to indicate the relationship between the objects, each object having a pointer that refers to each of the presentable objects adjacent thereto.

Joerg teaches the presentable objects being linked to indicate the relationship between the objects, each object having a pointer that refers to each of the presentable objects adjacent thereto. (paragraph 0033, 0034, linked list is a list where the pointer of each listed note points to an adjacent object)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Joerg's teaching with method of Humpleman in order to allow users to create variants over common subset of object by offering different entry points.

However, both Humpleman and Joerg fail to teach wherein the presentable object is a digital image obtained from a camera at a remote location in response to a sensor sensing a change at the remote location.

Endsley teaches wherein the presentable object is a digital image obtained from a camera at a remote location in response to a sensor sensing a change at the remote location. (column 2, lines 5-50)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Endsley's teaching with method of Humpleman and Joerg in order to provide user with the flexibility in selecting the modes that communicate information between a host computer and the camera.

As per claim 40, it is of the same scope as claim 39. Supra.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23, 25-38 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior arts fail to teach individually or in combination that:

“the presentable object is a digital image obtained from a camera at a remote location in response to a sensor sensing a change at the remote location;

a data store on the server-side of the system for storing the presentable object from the client-side, the presentable objects being linked to indicate the relationship between the objects , each object having a pointer that refers to each of the presentable objects adjacent thereto, wherein the viewable arrangement of the presentable objects displayed on a presentable environment over the Internet is based on the manner in which the presentable objects are linked;

wherein the arrangement of the presentable objects, reference, both within the placeholders corresponds at least in part to the manner in which the presented objects and references are linked on the client-side of the system.”

Response To Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 39-40 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100